



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,516	07/30/2001	Michael L. Aigen	FS-00534 (02890034AA)	9758

30743 7590 09/23/2004

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 340
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

ROCHE, TRENTON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/916,516

Applicant(s)

AIGEN, MICHAEL L.

Examiner

Trent J Roche

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07302001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is responsive to communications filed 30 July 2001.
2. Claims 1-13 have been examined.

Oath/Declaration

3. The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

4. Applicant has not given a post office address anywhere in the application papers as required by 37 CFR 1.33(a), which was in effect at the time of filing of the oath or declaration. A statement over applicant's signature providing a complete post office address is required.
5. The oath or declaration acknowledges the duty to disclose under 37 CFR 1.56(a). However, all parts of 37 CFR 1.56 must be acknowledged, as 37 CFR 1.63 states:

(3) State that the person making the oath or declaration acknowledges the duty to disclose to the Office all information known to the person to be material to patentability as defined in § 1.56

A replacement oath or declaration acknowledging the duty to disclose under 37 CFR 1.56 is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2124

7. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

8. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01.

Claim 1 is directed to a method for generating database application conversion automatically for tables in a database, however, there does not seem to be any aspect of the claim or the dependent claims which dictate what is automatic about the system, and where conversion of the database information is occurring. Rather, the claimed limitations recite invoking a computer application program to read table definitions, defining object classes and deployment descriptors, and producing a client-side helper class. Nowhere in the claim is it discussed how this assists the overall method of doing conversion of database tables, let alone automatically, as it would appear that the result of the method is the generation of files and classes, of which the use of these files and classes in the overall sense of conversion is not indicated. As such, the limitations recited in claim 1 are indefinite, and as such the scope of the claim cannot be reasonably ascertained.

9. Claims 4-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. Claims 4-13 are directed to specifics concerning the structure of generated files, however, there is no clear indication as to how the plurality of files generated assist the overall method for generating database application conversion automatically. Rather, the claims seem directed to disclosing how one would go about writing a file, plus specific naming conventions to be utilized in the file, and there is no clear indication as to what is performing the writing or generation of the files, nor to what structure the writing is occurring during the generation process. Indeed, the claims

Art Unit: 2124

as recited, taken in their broadest reasonable interpretation, indicate that a user could write the various methods, headers and tags on a piece of paper, or into a text editor on a computer system.

As such, the limitations recited in claims 4-13 are indefinite and as such the scope of the claims cannot be reasonably ascertained, and the functionality of the claims cannot be realized.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,591,272 to Williams.

Per claim 1:

Williams discloses:

- a method for generating database application conversion automatically for tables in a database (“an automated, expert method, system and program product that translates and transmits metadata and data from database tables...” in col. 4 lines 48-40)
- invoking a computer application program to read table definitions from the database (“OSF performs an inversion of teach database table at application build/generation time. That is,

Art Unit: 2124

each table is read from top to bottom and each value of each column is inspected” in col. 20 lines 41-44)

- the computer application program using existing database definitions to define object classes and deployment descriptors (“reading the definitional elements of the databases to determine data types and interrelationships...Source code for the classes is then generated...” in col. 4 lines 52-66)
- the computer application program producing a client-side helper class to coordinate the name of a database used in a Naming and Directory service with client code (“At the client computer, the received pseudo-object is assembled to retrieve the data values...and the metadata is then used to place these data values...into the user interface of the client computer...” in col. 8 lines 49-52)

substantially as claimed.

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Williams discloses utilizing a user interface to permit the user to interact with the computer application program (“An inexperienced user can, if so desired, easily select a subset of all possible objects represented by the databases through use of a simple and intuitive graphical interface” in col. 4 lines 60-62), collecting data (“translates and transmits metadata and data from database tables...” in col. 4 lines 49-50), generating files in a user-specified directory path (Note Figure 17, there is an option for output directory), and generating a Data JAVA file, a Home Interface JAVA file, a Remote Interface JAVA file, a Bean JAVA file, a Primary Key JAVA file, a Persistent JAVA file, an Enterprise JAVA Bean Deployment Descriptor XML file, an Enterprise JAVA Bean Jar batch command file, a Vendor-Specific Deployment XML

Art Unit: 2124

file, and a Vendor-Specific Build batch command file as claimed (“Enterprise EJB Architecture. The application server invokes the appropriate class server file as defined by the Deployment Descriptor and other configuration files used by a J2EE-compliant EJB application server” in col. 17 lines 64-67. Further, in col. 27, lines 64-65, “For EJB’s, XML deployment descriptors and are also generated.”)

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and further, Williams discloses querying the database to get names of all tables related to the database for the user to encapsulate the tables with the EJB; and querying the database to acquire information about fields within each the user has selected as claimed (“OSF performs an inversion of teach database table at application build/generation time. That is, each table is read from top to bottom and each value of each column is inspected” in col. 20 lines 41-44)

Per claims 4-13:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, claims 4-13 recite limitations as cited in claim 2. Further, Williams discloses the steps of generating the Data JAVA file, Home Interface JAVA file, Remote Interface JAVA file, Bean JAVA file, Primary Key JAVA file, Persistent JAVA file, Enterprise JAVA Bean Deployment Descriptor XML file, Enterprise JAVA Bean Jar batch command file, Vendor-Specific Deployment XML file, and Vendor-Specific Build batch command file as claimed, therefore, the Examiner interprets that all cited limitations are merely naming conventions for the above stated files. Therefore, the limitations of claims 4-13 are met by the reference.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trent J Roche whose telephone number is (703)305-4627. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703)305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Trent J Roche
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

TJR


ANIL KHATRI
PRIMARY EXAMINER